



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/556,795 04/25/00 HATA

S 106096

MMC2/0301

OLIFF & BERRIDGE PLC  
P O BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22320

EXAMINER

SARKAR, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2813

DATE MAILED: 03/01/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks**

438/778  
65/102

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/556,795

Applicant(s)

HATA ET AL.

Examiner

Asok K. Sarkar

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 3 - 22 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden on the Examiner. This is not found persuasive because the Examiner needs to search in two distinct classes for the two inventions constituting burden on the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Specification***

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in line 1, the sentence "... having an supercooled liquid ..." should be changed to "... having a supercooled liquid ...". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 3, lines 3 – 4, change the sentence to read "To iron out the above problems, these inventors have been intensely studying to develop ...". In page 3, line 7, change "... having an supercooled ..." to "... having a supercooled ...". In page 9, line 11, change "... after it heated ..." to "... after it is heated ...". In page 13, line 21, change "... film structure of thin example." to "... film structure of this example." In page 15, line 22, change Fig. 1 to Fig. 9. In page 16, line 2, change "... , it may be backward it by turning over the substrate." to "... , it may be bent backward by turning over the substrate."

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2813

3. Claims 3, and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 3, line three change an supercooled to a supercooled and in line 5, change " ... thin film in a given shape, ..." to " ... thin film to a given shape, ...". In claim 11, line 3, change " ... an opposite magnetic being ..." to " ... an opposite electrode being ...".

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 11, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 11, the generation of force between magnetic layer and the opposite electrode without any reference to the opposite electrode renders the claim indefinite.

Regarding claims 18 and 22, the use of the phrase thin film which are mixed in the last line of the claims is confusing. Use of confusing languages within claim renders the claim indefinite.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2813

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Werner, W., EP 0,783,108 A1.

Regarding claim 3, Werner discloses a micro-mechanical device, which has a thin film-structure composed of deformed thin film made of an amorphous material of doped glass (see the Basic Abstract) on a substrate. The presence of a supercooled liquid phase region is inherent in glass. Heating the thin film of glass to deform the film to a given shape is shown in Figures 2 and 3. Processes of heating to a temperature within the supercooled region to deform the glass and cooling the glass to room temperature to retain the deformed structure are inherent in the disclosed method.

Regarding claim 5, deformation of the thin film of glass by its own weight is inherent in the disclosed method.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werner, W., EP 0,783,108 A1.

Werner discloses a thin film-structure as explained above regarding claim 1.

Werner fails to disclose the amorphous material having a glass transition temperature within 200 - 600°C and a temperature width of not less than 20°C in the supercooled liquid phase region.

Examiner takes Official Notice that many glassy materials are known to possess a glass transition temperature within 200 - 600°C and a temperature width of not less than 20°C in the supercooled liquid phase region.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ an amorphous material of glass having a glass transition temperature within 200 - 600°C and a temperature width of not less than 20°C in the supercooled liquid phase region since the examiner takes Official Notice that amorphous materials with a glass transition temperature within 200 - 600°C and a temperature width of not less than 20°C in the supercooled liquid phase region is well known.

10. Claims 6, 7 and 9 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werner, W., EP 0,783,108 A1 in view of Aksyuk et al., US 5,994,159.

Regarding claim 6, Werner fails to teach deformation of thin film in the thin film structure by mechanical external force.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of fabricating a thin film structure for micro-mechanical device in which the thin film beam 8 (see Fig. 1) is deformed by external mechanical force in column 6, line 22.

Therefore, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2813

to deform the thin film of Werner by mechanical external force to form the thin film structure.

Regarding claim 7, Werner fails to teach deformation of thin film in the thin film structure by electrostatic external force.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of fabricating a thin film structure for micro-mechanical device in which the thin film beam 8 (see Fig. 1) is deformed by external electrostatic force in column 5, line 62..

Therefore, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deform the thin film of Werner by electrostatic external force to form the thin film structure.

Regarding claim 9, Werner fails to teach deformation of thin film in the thin film structure by electrostatic external force.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of fabricating a thin film structure for micro-mechanical device in which the thin film beam 8 (see Fig. 1) is deformed by external electrostatic force wherein an electrode layer made of conductive material is formed nearby the thin film, an opposite electrode being formed opposing the thin film and the thin film is deformed by the electrostatic external forces generated between the electrode layer and the opposite electrode in between column 5, line 61 and column 6, line 13.

Therefore, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to deform the thin film of Werner by electrostatic external force to form the thin film structure wherein an electrode layer made of conductive material is formed nearby the thin film, an opposite electrode being formed opposing the thin film and the thin film is deformed by the electrostatic external forces generated between the electrode layer and the opposite electrode.

Regarding claim 10, Werner fails to teach deformation of thin film in the thin film structure by magnetic external force.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of fabricating a thin film structure for micro-mechanical device in which the thin film beam 8 (see Fig. 1) is deformed by external magnetic force in column 6, line 15.

Therefore, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deform the thin film of Werner by magnetic external force to form the thin film structure.

Regarding claim 11, Werner fails to teach deformation of thin film in the thin film structure by magnetic external force.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of fabricating a thin film structure for micro-mechanical device in which the thin film beam 8 (see Fig. 1) is deformed by external electrostatic force wherein a magnetic layer made of a magnetic material is formed nearby the thin film, an opposite magnet being formed opposing the thin film and the thin film is deformed by the magnetic external forces generated between the magnetic layer and the opposite magnet in column 6, lines 14 - 20.



Therefore, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deform the thin film of Werner by applying magnetic external force to form the thin film structure wherein a magnetic layer made of a magnetic material is formed nearby the thin film, an opposite magnet being formed opposing the thin film and the thin film is deformed by the magnetic external forces generated between the magnetic layer and the opposite magnet.

Regarding claims 12 – 14, Werner teaches deforming the thin film amorphous material by heating as described earlier with respect to claims 3 and 5.

Werner fails to teach deforming the thin film by magnetic forces where the thin film is heated in the Curie Temperature range of the magnetic material such as Ni, Fe, Co and Mn, the Curie Temperature being in the range of 210 – 1200°C.

Aksyuk et al. teaches deforming the thin film by magnetic forces generated by induced current but fails to expressly teach that the magnetic force can be generated by using magnetic materials such as Ni, Fe, Co and Mn having the Curie Temperature in the range of 210 – 1200°C.

However, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deform the thin film of Werner by heating it within supercooled liquid region and applying magnetic external force to form the thin film structure wherein a magnetic layer is made of a common magnetic materials such as Ni, Fe, Co and Mn having the Curie Temperature in the range of 210 – 1200°C in stead of an electromagnet.

Regarding claims 15 – 18, Werner teaches deforming the thin film amorphous material by heating as described earlier with respect to claims 3 and 5.

Regarding claim 15, Werner fails to teach to form a subsidiary layer made of a material having a different thermal expansion coefficient from that of the amorphous material nearby the film and the thin film is deformed by the stress resulting from the difference in thermal expansion coefficient between the thin film and the subsidiary layer generated in their interface. Werner also fails to teach the magnitude of the thermal expansion coefficient, the thickness of the subsidiary layer and the make up of the subsidiary layer.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of producing a thin film-structure where the beam is made up of two layers with one layer being polysilicon of a thickness of 1.5 micron and each layer having different linear thermal expansion and the deformation of the thin film is actuated by generating stress due to differential contraction of the two layers which is the result of different linear thermal expansion.

Therefore, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deform the thin film by modifying Werner's method using a subsidiary layer made of material having different linear thermal expansion than that of the amorphous thin film material and by simultaneous application of heat.

Regarding claims 16 – 18, Aksyuk et al. teaches the thickness of the subsidiary layer in column 5, line 11 but fails to expressly teach the magnitude of the thermal

Art Unit: 2813

expansion coefficient, and the make up of the subsidiary layer except that it is polysilicon in column 5, line 10.

However, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to judiciously adjust and control parameters of the subsidiary layer such as thermal expansion coefficient, which also depends on the composition and the relative thickness of this layer with respect to the thin film during the deformation of an amorphous glassy thin film structure by the generation of stress due to thermal expansion mismatch through routine experimentation and optimization to achieve optimum benefits (see MPEP 2144.05) and it would not yield any unexpected results. Since the deformation is also induced by heat, it would be logical to combine the substrate material with the thin film material to provide an efficient deformation mechanism by the thermal expansion mismatch technique.

Regarding claims 19 – 22, Werner teaches deforming the thin film amorphous material by heating as described earlier with respect to claims 3 and 5.

Regarding claim 16, Werner fails to teach to form a subsidiary layer including an internal stress is formed nearby the film and the thin film is deformed by the stress resulting from the difference in internal stress between the thin film and the subsidiary layer generated in their interface. Werner also fails to teach the magnitude of the compressive or tensile stress, the thickness of the subsidiary layer and the make up of the subsidiary layer.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of producing a thin film-structure where the beam is made up of two layers with one layer being polysilicon of a thickness of 1.5 micron and each layer having high intrinsic strain and the deformation of the thin film is actuated due to internal stresses of the two in column 5, lines 19 - 33.

Regarding claims 20 – 22, Aksyuk et al. fails to expressly disclose the magnitude of the stress in the subsidiary layer, the relative thickness with respect to the thin film and the composition of the subsidiary layer made by mixing the substrate and the amorphous thin film.

However, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to judiciously adjust and control parameters of the subsidiary layer such as the magnitude of the internal intrinsic stress which also depends on the composition and the relative thickness with respect to the thin film during the deformation of an amorphous glassy thin film structure by the generation of stress due to the difference in internal stress between them through routine experimentation and optimization to achieve optimum benefits (see MPEP 2144.05) and it would not yield any unexpected results. Since the deformation is also induced by heat, it would be logical to combine the substrate material with the thin film material to provide an efficient deformation mechanism by the internal stress differences between the two materials.

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werner, W., EP 0,783,108 A1 in view of Aksyuk et al., US 5,994,159 as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Tregilgas et al., EP 0,762,176 A2.

Werner fails to teach deformation of thin film in the thin film structure by electrostatic external force.

Aksyuk et al. teaches a method of fabricating a thin film structure for micro-mechanical device in which the thin film beam 8 (see Fig. 1) is deformed by external electrostatic force wherein an electrode layer made of conductive material is formed nearby the thin film, an opposite electrode being formed opposing the thin film and the thin film is deformed by the electrostatic external forces generated between the electrode layer and the opposite electrode in between column 5, line 61 and column 6, line 13.

Aksyuk et al. fails to expressly teach that the thin film is made of a conductive material.

Tregilgas et al. teaches a method of producing a thin film structure where they teach forming a beam 24 (see Fig. 3f) of an amorphous conductive material (nitrided aluminum or non-aluminum alloy) in column 1, lines 49 – 53.

Therefore, given the substantial teaching of Werner in view of Aksyuk et al. and further in view of Tregilgas et al., it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deform the thin film of Werner by electrostatic external force to form the thin film structure wherein the thin film is made of conductive material and the thin film is deformed by the external electrostatic force generated between the thin film and the opposite electrode to form the thin film structure.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2813


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asok K. Sarkar whose telephone number is (703) 308-2521. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Bowers can be reached on (703) 308-2417. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-4918.

Asok K. Sarkar  
February 26, 2001

E-Mail: [asok.sarkar@uspto.gov](mailto:asok.sarkar@uspto.gov)



Charles Bowers  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800